

On a Generalization of the van der Waerden Theorem

Rudi Hirschfeld
University of Antwerp
rudihirschfeld@hetnet.nl

February 2, 2008

Abstract

For a given length and a given degree and an arbitrary partition of the positive integers, there always is a cell containing a polynomial progression of that length and that degree; moreover, the coefficients of the generating polynomial can be chosen from a given subsemigroup and one can prescribe the occurring powers. A multidimensional version is included.

1 Introduction

A sequence in $\mathbb{R}$ will be called a *polynomial progression* if it is of the form $\{P(1), P(2), P(3), \dots\}$ for some polynomial $P(x) = a_d x^d + a_{d-1} x^{d-1} + \dots + a_1 x + a_0$. This progression is said to be of *degree* d if P has degree equal to d and not less.

Theorem 1. *Given two positive integers d and l , if the set of the positive integers is split up into finitely many non-overlapping parts, there exists a polynomial progression of length l and of degree d that belongs to precisely one of these parts.*

For $d = 1$ the polynomials look like $P(x) = a + bx$ and the l -segment of the polynomial progression takes the form $\{a + b, a + 2b, a + 3b, \dots, a + lb\}$: the theorem boils down to the well-known van der Waerden Theorem on monochromatic arithmetic progressions. It is fun to write down the $d = 2$ case.

Corollary 1. *Given any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and any finite coloring of $\mathbb{N}$, there exist three positive integers a, b and c for which all terms in $\{a + b + c, a + 2b + 4c, a + 3b + 9c, \dots, a + lb + l^2 c\}$ have the same color.*

The 1927 proof of van der Waerden's Theorem is quite complicated, involving a double induction argument. The 1927 issue of the journal, (3), is difficult to access nowadays, but a very clear exposition is found in R.L. GRAHAM, B.L. ROTHSCHILD AND J.H. SPENCER (1), pp 29 – 34. As B.L. van der Waerden once remarked, around 1927 he was not aware of the impact of his result as a prototypical Ramsey Theorem - after all, Ramsey's famous paper stems from 1930 - and merely considered it as a clever exercise. A proof of the above

theorem by means of induction seems a Sisyphean task. We rather use some ideal theory in the semigroup $\beta\mathbb{N}$. As a matter of fact, the argument in the HINDMAN-STRAUSS treatise (2) for the van der Waerden Theorem (see 14.1 *l.c.*) is readily adapted to the present situation. By preferring the smooth $\beta\mathbb{N}$ -argument to a complicated induction proof we ignore the calvinistic concern (see (2) p.280) that it “is enough to make someone raised on the work ethic feel guilty”.

The more restrictions one puts on the admissible polynomials, the fewer polynomials one has at his/her disposal and the more difficult it seems to force the ensuing polynomial progressions into one and the same cell. The polynomials $P(x) = \sum_{k=0}^d a_k x^k$ we admit here satisfy

- the admissible coefficients a_k belong to one and the same subsemigroup $\mathbb{S}$ of $(\omega, +)$, where $\omega = \mathbb{N} \cup 0$;
- the admissible exponents in the powers x^k belong to a subset $\mathbb{D} \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, d\}$ containing d .

Such polynomials will be called $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{D})$ -polynomials.

The sharpened theorem reads

Theorem 2. *Given two positive integers d and l , if the set of the positive integers is split up into finitely many non-overlapping parts, there exists a polynomial progression of length l and of degree d , generated by a $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{D})$ -polynomial, that belongs to precisely one of these parts.*

2 Proof

Since Theorem 1 concerns the special case where $\mathbb{S} = \omega$ and $\mathbb{D} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, d\}$, we only need to prove Theorem 2.

Fix d and l in $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $l > d$. In fact, once the theorem has been proved for “long” progressions (that is $l > d$), then the pertinent cell certainly contains shorter segments ($l \leq d$). We consider polynomials $P(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i x^i$ in one indeterminate x of degree $\leq d$ with coefficients in ω^{d+1} . Consider the following sets S_o and I_o in ω^l consisting of l consecutive polynomial values

$$\begin{aligned} S_o &= \{ \{P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)\} \in \omega^l : P(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{D}} a_k x^k, \text{ with } \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d\} \in \mathbb{S}^{d+1} \} \\ I_o &= \{ \{P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)\} \in \mathbb{N}^l : P(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{D}} a_k x^k, \text{ with } \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d\} \in (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{N})^{d+1} \} \end{aligned}$$

The impact of the assumption that $l > d$ is that each element in S_o corresponds to a *unique* polynomial. In fact, if such an l -tuple would be generated by two different polynomials, the difference of these polynomials would have more zeros (*viz.* at the l points $1, 2, \dots, l$ in $\mathbb{C}$) than its degree $d < l$ permits.

S_o is a subsemigroup of $\mathbb{S}^{d+1}$ under coordinatewise addition, the restrictions $k \in \mathbb{D}$ meaning that only addition of coordinates k from $\mathbb{D}$ matters. In fact, the sum of two l -tuples

in S_o corresponds to the sum of their unique polynomials and the latter is again a polynomial of degree $\leq d$ with coefficients in the semigroup $\mathbb{S}$.

The progressions $\{P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)\}$ in I_o all have degree $= d$, since $a_d \geq 1$. It follows that I_o is a proper subset of S_o . Obviously, I_o is also a semigroup. Moreover, I_o is an ideal in S_o . In fact, upon adding any point in S_o to an arbitrary element of I_o , all coefficients of the sum polynomial are again ≥ 1 and this polynomial is of exact degree d . Although trivial, we notice that S_o contains constant $\mathbb{N}$ -valued polynomials, but I_o contains none of these. This will be instrumental shortly.

Consider the Stone-Ćech compactification $\beta\omega$. We are going to use a few facts about $\beta\omega$ that are found in N. HINDMAN AND D. STRAUSS (2). We find it convenient to ignore the slight differences in the ideal theory between the two *semigroups* (see (2), Chap. 4) $\beta\omega$ and $\beta\mathbb{N}$, writing $\beta\mathbb{N}$ where $\beta\omega$ would sometimes be more appropriate. From this point on we can follow the proof of the van der Waerden Theorem in (2), Theorem 14.1, almost *verbatim*.

Take the compact product space $Y = (\beta\mathbb{N})^l$ and the closures $S = cl_Y(S_o)$ and $I = cl_Y(I_o)$. The semigroup $\beta\mathbb{N}$ has a *smallest* ideal $K(\beta\mathbb{N}) \neq \emptyset$ (see (2), Chap 4), which will be our main tool.

Take any point $p \in K(\beta\mathbb{N})$ and consider the constant l -tuple $\vec{p} = \{p, p, \dots, p\}$. The crucial step is to show that $\vec{p}$ belongs to S .

The closures $cl_{\beta\mathbb{N}} B$ of the members $B \in p$ form a neighborhood basis in $\beta\mathbb{N}$ around p . It follows that for the product topology in Y there exist members $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r \in p$ for which the box $U = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} cl_{\beta\mathbb{N}}(B_i)$ is a Y -neighborhood of $\vec{p}$. The intersection $\cap_{1 \leq i \leq r} cl_{\beta\mathbb{N}}(B_i)$ is a $\beta\mathbb{N}$ -neighborhood of p . The set $\mathbb{N}$ lying dense in $\beta\mathbb{N}$, it is intersected by this neighborhood. Select $a \in \mathbb{N} \cap (\cap_{1 \leq i \leq r} cl_{\beta\mathbb{N}}(B_i))$. The constant l -string $\vec{a} = \{a, a, \dots, a\}$ thus belongs to U . Also, S_o containing all constant l -tuples, we have $\vec{a} \in S_o$. Consequently, we have $\vec{a} \in S_o \cap U$. This shows that $\vec{p}$ belongs to the closure of S_o in Y , and so $\vec{p} \in S$, indeed.

Next we use the fact that by (2), Theorem 2.23, the K -functor preserves products. From $p \in K(\beta\mathbb{N})$ we infer $\vec{p} \in (K(\beta\mathbb{N}))^l = K((\beta\mathbb{N})^l) = K(Y)$. Conclusion: $\vec{p} \in S \cap K(Y)$.

Having shown that $S \cap K(Y) \neq \emptyset$, we can invoke (2), Theorem 1.65 to determine the smallest ideal of the semigroup S : it simply is $K(S) = S \cap K(Y)$. This leads to

$$\vec{p} \in K(S). \tag{2.1}$$

Obviously, I is an ideal in S . The smallest ideal in S is contained in I : $K(S) \subset I$. It follows from (2.1) that $\vec{p} \in I$.

Finally, let $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_i A_i$ be a finite partition. The closures $\bar{A}_i = cl_{\beta\mathbb{N}} A_i$ are open and form a partition of $\beta\mathbb{N}$. Hence, precisely one of them, $\bar{A}_j$ say, is a $\beta\mathbb{N}$ -neighborhood of our point $p \in K(\beta\mathbb{N})$. Then $V = (\bar{A}_j)^l$ is a Y -neighborhood of $\vec{p}$. Because $\vec{p} \in I$, V must meet the dense subset I_o of I and we can select a polynomial P in in such a manner that $\{P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)\}$ belongs to V . But the $P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)$ still are integers in $\mathbb{N}$. For this reason

$$\{P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)\} \subset \bar{A}_j \cup \mathbb{N} = A_j$$

and the segment $\{P(1), P(2), \dots, P(l)\}$ has the color of A_j . □

3 Free gifts

The essential property of the set A_j used in the last part of the above proof is the fact that $\bar{A}_j$ contains a point p belonging to $K(\beta\mathbb{N})$, or $A_j \in p$. Sets $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ belonging to some $p \in K(\beta\mathbb{N})$ are called *piecewise syndetic* sets. We recall that in terms of $\mathbb{N}$ itself, A is piecewise syndetic if and only if the *gaps* between its intervals of consecutive elements remain bounded in lengths, (see (2) Theorem 4.40). It follows that A_j may be replaced by any infinite piecewise syndetic set A and we get as a

Bonus 3. *Given a piecewise syndetic set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, a length l and a degree d , there exists a polynomial progression of degree d for which the first l terms belong to A .*

Finally we consider a *multidimensional* version of the theorem, dealing with m polynomial progressions of varying lengths and degrees simultaneously.

Bonus 4. *Pick the following items in $\mathbb{N}$: a dimension parameter m , degrees $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m$, and lengths $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_m$. If the set $\mathbb{N}$ is split up into finitely many non-overlapping parts, there exist m polynomial progressions of length l_i and of degree d_i each, $1 \leq i \leq m$, that simultaneously belong to one of these parts. Also, any given piecewise syndetic set contains such a collection of polynomial progressions.*

Remark There is an obvious $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{D})$ version.

Proof. We introduce arrays

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{pmatrix} P_1(1) & P_1(2) \cdots P_1(l_1) \\ P_2(1) & P_2(2) \cdots P_2(l_2) \\ \dots & \dots\dots\dots \\ P_m(1) & P_m(2) \cdots P_m(l_m) \end{pmatrix}$$

generated by polynomials $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m$ with coefficients from ω .

These arrays $\mathcal{P}$ need not have the customary rectangular form, the i^{th} row having l_i entries. Extending these rows by putting zeros in the empty places until they all get $\max\{l_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ entries would unnecessarily complicate the definition of $\mathcal{I}_o$ *infra*.)

We have avoided to call these $\mathcal{P}$ matrices since they are not intended to act as transformations in some vector space. In order to describe the set these arrays belong to we write $e_i = \{0, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0\} = \delta_{ij}$ for the usual unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^m$. These unit vectors are customarily envisaged as rows; upon transposition we get the unit columns e_i^T . The direct sum decomposition

$$\omega^m = e_1^T \omega \oplus e_2^T \omega \oplus \cdots \oplus e_m^T \omega$$

divides ω^m , and thereby $\mathbb{N}^m$, into m horizontal layers, each equal to $\mathbb{N}$ and each row is an additive semigroup at its own.

$$e_i^T \mathbb{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \dots \\ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ \dots \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Picture: the i^{th} row of an array $\mathcal{P}$ is contained in the i^{th} layer.

Upon replacing the l -tuples in the definitions of S_o and I_o by the arrays $\mathcal{P}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_o &= \{\mathcal{P} \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^m e_i^T \mathbb{N} : P_i(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} a_{ki} x^k, \text{ with } \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{d_i}\} \in \omega^{d_i+1} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_o &= \{\mathcal{P} \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^m e_i^T \mathbb{N} : P_i(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} a_{ki} x^k, \text{ with } \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{d_i}\} \in \mathbb{N}^{d_i+1} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}.\end{aligned}$$

These are subsemigroups of the $\bigoplus_{i=1}^m e_i^T \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{I}_o$ is a proper ideal in $\mathcal{S}_o$.

We refrain from repeating all details the above proof for the $m = 1$ case.

For a start, we may assume without loss of generality that $l_1 > d_1, l_2 > d_2, \dots, l_m > d_m$. Define $l = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} l_i$. This time we have to deal with the compact space Y^m , one $Y = (\beta\mathbb{N})^l$ for each layer, so that $Y^m = (\beta\mathbb{N})^{lm}$. The closure $\mathcal{I} = cl_{Y^m}(\mathcal{I}_o)$ is an ideal in the semigroup $\mathcal{S} = cl_{Y^m}(\mathcal{S}_o)$

To every $p \in K(\beta\mathbb{N})$ we assign the constant $m \times l$ array

$$\vec{p} = \begin{pmatrix} p & p \cdots p \\ p & p \cdots p \\ \dots\dots\dots \\ p & p \cdots p \end{pmatrix}$$

After a little twist the above argument leads to $\vec{p} \in K(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathcal{I}$. For a piecewise syndetic set $A \in p$ the product $V = (\bar{A})^l$ is a Y^m -neighborhood of $\vec{p}$ which intersects the dense subset $\mathcal{I}_o$ of $\mathcal{I}$ in at least one point. This point is an array $\mathcal{P}$, say. It follows that the entries $P_i(j)$ of $\mathcal{P}$ belong to $cl_{Y^m} A$ and thus to $cl_{\beta\mathbb{N}} A$. All $P_i(j)$ being positive integers, we may write

$$\bigcup \{P_i(j) : i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, l_i\} \subset \bar{A} \cap \mathbb{N}.$$

Conclusion: these m polynomial progressions do lie in A itself. □

References

- [1] R.L. GRAHAM, B.L. ROTHCHILD AND J.H. SPENCER (1990), *Ramsey Theory*; Second Edition; New York: John Wiley & Sons
- [2] N. HINDMAN AND D. STRAUSS (1998), *Algebra in the Stone-Ćech compactification, Theory and Applications*; Berlin: W. De Gruyter
- [3] B.L. VAN DER WAERDEN (1927), *Beweis einer Baudetschen Vermutung*, Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde 19, 212 – 216.